#### **REGULAR MEETING**

#### MAYOR AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES, VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE, IL

#### **AUGUST 10, 2009**

<u>CALL TO ORDER</u> The Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Board of Trustees of August 10, 2009 was held in the Meeting Room of the Village Hall, 7660 County Line Road, Burr Ridge, Illinois and called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Trustee Paveza.

<u>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</u> was conducted by Christyna Spreck of Pleasantdale Elementary School.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Village Clerk and the results denoted the following present: Trustees Sodikoff, Paveza, Allen, Grela & DeClouette. Absent: Mayor Grasso & Trustee Wott. Also present were Village Administrator Steve Stricker, Community Development Director Doug Pollock, Acting Police Chief John Madden, Village Clerk Karen Thomas and Village Attorney Terry Barnicle.

There being a quorum, the meeting was open to official business.

**AUDIENCE** There were none at this time.

CONSENT AGENDA – OMNIBUS VOTE

President, motion was made by Trustee Allen and seconded by Trustee DeClouette that the Consent Agenda – Omnibus Vote, (attached as Exhibit A), and the recommendations indicated for each respective item, be hereby approved.

On Roll Call, Vote Was:

AYES:

5 – Trustees Allen, DeClouette, Grela, Paveza & Sodikoff

NAYS:

0 - None

ABSENT:

1 – Trustee Wott

There being five affirmative votes, the motion carried.

MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 13, 2009

were approved for publication

under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 27, 2009

were approved for publication

under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

MINUTES - VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMITTEE MEETING OF JULY 8, 2009

were noted as received and filed under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

MINUTES – (DRAFT) VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMITTEE MEETING OF JULY 15.

**2009** were noted as received and filed under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

bjt

<u>MINUTES – (DRAFT) VETERANS MEMORIAL COMMITTEE MEETING OF JULY 22, 2009</u> were noted as received and filed under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

<u>MINUTES – (DRAFT) PLAN COMMISSION COMMITTEE MEETING OF AUGUST 3,</u> <u>2009</u> were noted as received and filed under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

MINUTES – (DRAFT) DOWNTOWN EVENTS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING OF AUGUST 4, 2009 were noted as received and filed under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

ORDINANCE GRANTING SPECIAL USES FOR A RESTAURANT WITH SALES OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, EXTENDED HOURS OF OPERATION AND FOR A NON-RESIDENTIAL FENCE PURSUANT TO THE VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE (Z-06-2009: 15W776 NORTH FRONTAGE RD – PORTERHOUSE STEAK & SEAFOOD) The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, approved the Ordinance granting special use approvals for a restaurant with the service of alcoholic beverages, extension of hours of operation and construction of a non-residential fence. The property is located at 15W776 North Frontage Road.

THIS IS ORDINANCE NO. A-834-09-09

ORDINANCE GRANTING VARIATIONS FROM THE VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING (Z-06-2009: 15W776

NORTH FRONTAGE RD. – PORTERHOUSE STEAK & SEAFOOD)

The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, approved the Ordinance granting a zoning variation for relief from the parking lot landscaping requirements. The property is located at 15W776 North Frontage Road

THIS IS ORDINANCE NO. A-834-10-09

ORDINANCE GRANTING A SPECIAL USE FOR A TRAINING CENTER FOR

DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED PERSONS PURSUANT TO THE VILLAGE OF BURR

RIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE (Z-07-2009: 16W361 SOUTH FRONTAGE ROAD – BY

YOUR SIDE) The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, approved the

Ordinance granting a special use for a training center for developmentally disabled persons. The

property is located at 16W361 South Frontage Road.

THIS IS ORDINANCE NO. A-834-11-09

ORDINANCE GRANTING A SPECIAL USE FOR A SCHOOL FOR DEVELOMENTALLY DISABLED PERSONS PURSUANT TO THE VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE (Z-08-2009: 8320 MADISON STREET – SOARING EAGLE ACADEMY)

fit

The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, approved the Ordinance granting a special use for a school for developmentally disabled persons. The property is located at 8320 Madison Street

THIS IS ORDINANCE NO. A-834-12-09

RECOMMENDATION TO ADD "EVENT PLANNING AND LIMOUSINE CHARTER SERVICE" TO THE LIST OF SPECIAL USES IN THE B-2 DISTRICT (PC-07-2009; 15W320 NORTH FRONTAGE ROAD – ELVIS LIMOUSINE AND CHARTER) The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, accepted the Plan Commission's recommendation to classify existing uses at 15W308 and 15W320 North Frontage Road as special uses in the B-2 District. The uses include a licensing & insurance office and an event planning & limousine charter service.

RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR MATERIAL TESTING SERVICES IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE NEW POLICE FACILITY The Board, under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote, awarded the contract for material testing services as part of the construction of the Police facility to Universal Construction Testing (UCT) in the amount of \$41,820.

<u>VOUCHERS</u> in the amount of \$260,538.99 for the period ending August 10, 2009 and payroll in the amount of \$187,950.04 for the period ending July 25, 2009 were approved for payment under the Consent Agenda by Omnibus Vote.

### RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE LOT LINE VARIATION (V-03-2009: 21 WOODGATE DRIVE – JOHNSTON)

Doug Pollock, Community Development Director, presented the recommendation from the Plan Commission to grant a variation which would permit a room addition to be built with a setback from the rear lot line of 10 feet rather than the required 50 feet. The property is at 21 Woodgate Drive at the end of a cul-de-sac street. It is a 5 sided lot with the front lot line, two side lot lines and two rear lot lines according to the current application of the Zoning Ordinance. When the house was built in 1973 and an addition in 1993, the interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance by the zoning administrator was somewhat different. They treated the west lot line as a side lot line and as a result it has an approximate 10 foot setback. It is clear in the current application of the Zoning Ordinance that this is a rear lot line and, therefore, requires a 50 foot setback. The Petitioner's request is based on the unique configuration of the lot and the fact that the application of the Zoning Ordinance creates a hardship for the property owner.

Mr. Pollock continued that there were two neighbors represented at the public hearing. The neighbors most directly impacted by the proposed addition, to the west, objected based on the impact on their property and their sense that it would create a loss of privacy for their property. The Plan Commission concluded that the prior application of the Zoning Ordinance with the 10 foot

Spit

setback rather than 50 feet for the west lot line, did create a hardship in the continued use of the property. The Petitioner presented evidence that it reduced the effective buildable area from some 58% to 28% of the lot area. The Petitioner also presented evidence that there were only two other lots in the Village that could be considered similar to this in their opinion. One is located immediately across the street in the same subdivision and the other is a double lot on Park Ave. that would not have the same condition because it is used as two lots for one home.

Mr. Pollock continued that based on those findings the Plan Commission did agree that this variation met the findings of fact and they recommended approval of the variation limited to the addition as shown in the Petitioner's plans and also subject to the requirement that screening be provided in this area and that there be no construction traffic along this west lot line that would interfere with the neighbors property.

Trustee Grela indicated that in his opinion this is a textbook case of a variation where the burden of proof, the hardship, was not imposed by the applicant. It was truly a situation where categorically and historically this house was constructed and added to based on the west lot line – traditionally was the sideyard, not the rear yard. The change in the Zoning Ordinance then negatively impacted, in his opinion, that particular property and made any future additions almost unbuildable or to seek this type of variation. Trustee Grela said he visited both sites. It appears that the Erskine house is in excess of 150 feet away from this particular property line and it is densely compacted with trees, bushes, etc. He has absolutely no objection as he does not see an intrusion on the Erskines.

In answer to Trustee Allen, Mr. Pollock said the landscaping details were left up to staff to review and approve the final plan. The condition, as recommended by the Plan Commission, requires a solid landscaping barrier provided with a minimum height at the time of planting of 6 feet and extending the minimum length 40 feet adjacent to the addition.

Cathleen Keating spoke on behalf of the Kings who live north of the property, stating that they do not object but at the Plan Commission meeting they did ask that a limitation be placed on exterior lights so that after 10:00 p.m. only motion sensitive lights are utilized. She believes the Plan Commission limited it only to the portions of the addition that face west, towards the Erskine property. Her client's bedroom faces this home and there are a lot of exterior lights now in the backyard that are on all night.

Trustee Paveza said that part of the Plan Commission's comments were that any lighting that is to be added to the addition shall be down lighting and shall not include spotlights.

Mr. Smutny, Architect and homebuilder for the owner of the property, said that as part of the construction, there is to be a lighting control system that will control those lights. He continued that there are five conditions as part of the granting of the variation. The fifth condition deals with the relocation of the shed on the property. Based on the reinterpretation of the rearyard setback he was talked into a situation where he has a non-conforming accessory structure. He requests Board

left

approval to not relocate that building. This shed existed before the Johnston's purchased the property. You cannot see the shed unless you are on the Johnston property. The neighbor most impacted by this structure is Ms. Scanlon and she has no problem with it.

Mr. Pollock explained that he does not know the history other than there was no permit issued for the structure and it is in a location that is not currently permitted nor was ever permitted, to his knowledge, by the zoning ordinance. Sheds were never allowed in the sideyard or in a front yard.

Mr. Smutny explained that the structure would have to be demolished and rebuilt – it could not just be lifted and relocated. It is used during the winter months to store storm windows and yard furniture.

Greg Trzupek, Chairman of the Plan Commission, commented that part of the addition plan is for an addition to the garage. The logic was that they are adding a storage space onto the garage and it could take the place of the shed.

Mr. Smutny said the new gardening storage, as it is described on the drawings, is for garden tools and such things to make it more convenient for Mrs. Johnston to garden. That was the point of this structure; basically to be a storage facility.

Terry Barnicle, Village Attorney, said that based upon the fact that it's been there for a number of years preceding this current owner, if permission is granted for it to remain, it would have very limited effect from a precedential standpoint. It's an unusual piece of property.

Motion was made by Trustee Grela and seconded by Trustee DeClouette to accept the Plan Commission recommendation and direct Staff to prepare the Ordinance granting the variations with Items #1-#4 listed on the August 4, 2009 letter and a condition that the shed be allowed to remain as a legally non-conforming structure. This allows the shed to remain but it cannot be replaced if ever destroyed or removed.

On Roll Call, Vote Was:

AYES: 5 – Trustees Grela, DeClouette, Sodikoff, Paveza & Allen

NAYS: 0 - None

ABSENT: 1 - Trustee Wott

There being five affirmative votes, the motion carried.

## RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE REZONING AND VARIATIONS (Z-09-2009: 7700 COUNTY LINE ROAD – VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE

Mr. Pollock stated the recommendation is to rezone the property at 7700 County Line Road from the R-2A District to the T-1 Transitional District and to grant variations to reduce the corner sideyard setback and to allow a limited number of guest parking spaces located in the front buildable area.

9305

Spjt

This petition is to accommodate the new Burr Ridge police building across the street from the Village Hall. One resident, immediately to the west of the subject property, was concerned about stormwater management and drainage on to their property. Another resident from 75<sup>th</sup> Street was concerned about tree preservation and it was explained that because of the need to provide stormwater management and to drain the property effectively into a detention pond, it was necessary to regrade the property and that is the primary reason that more trees were unable to be saved.

Mr. Pollock continued that prior to the public hearing, staff contacted all three of the immediately adjacent homeowners to explain the purpose of the hearing and the zoning actions and the most affected property owner immediately to the south had no issues or concerns. Staff also presented written findings to the Plan Commission which are included in their recommendation. Those findings explain the rationale behind the rezoning and the variations.

Mr. Stricker talked about the residents' concerns about the trees and that staff knew that because of stormwater requirements not many of the trees could be saved but there will be a lot of replanting.

Greg Trzupek, Chairman of the Plan Commission, stated his concerns about the dry detention basin and suggested that this is an area where the water could be detained and actually have a chance to get into the ground.

The Village Administrator said that we are trying to keep a more manicured type look in front of the building and along County Line Road. We are not looking to plant wetland plants or those types of things. The area will be irrigated to keep the grass green.

There was discussion about having something put on the website so residents can see how the landscaping will look. Mr. Stricker said he would be happy to sit down with any residents that have any concerns.

<u>Motion</u> was made by Trustee Allen and seconded by Trustee Grela to accept the Plan Commission recommendation and direct staff to prepare an Ordinance rezoning the property and granting the variations as presented.

On Roll Call, Vote Was:

AYES: 5 – Trustees Allen, Grela, DeClouette, Sodikoff & Paveza

NAYS: 0 - None

ABSENT: 1 - Trustee Wott

There being five affirmative votes, the motion carried.

REQUEST FROM W.H. MCNAUGHTON BUILDERS FOR RELIEF FROM SECTION 222 OF THE BUILDING ORDINANCE RELATED TO THE DURATION AND EXPIRATION OF BUILDING PERMITS

Sex

Mr. Pollock presented a request from Bill McNaughton, the owner and developer of the Woodland Park PUD. He explained that this is a multiple building PUD located on the south side of 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, east of Route 83 and north of Meadowbrook Drive. A few years ago an expansion of that PUD was approved wherein they were allowed to add two new buildings. Mr. McNaughton would like to complete the parking, landscaping and foundations for the two buildings but not proceed with the construction of the buildings until he has contracts with the tenants. Under the current regulations if they stop work for two months, the permits would expire and they would have to start with a new building permit. They would like a period of time to be able to market the property and then move quickly once they have tenants. They have submitted a letter from an architect certifying that he believes there would be no damage to the foundation. Staff has no objection to a reasonable accommodation.

Bill McNaughton stated that he believes the ordinance is a fair one but was written in a time far different from what he is experiencing today. He has installed 95% of the public improvements required by the PUD. The pond is done, Meadowbrook Drive watermain is done, all underground utilities are finished. The commercial market is not that strong. There are some companies still out there that need space. He wants to be able to generate prospective tenants and by showing them the site, they could become interested and by having the foundations in, the timing of constructing the building and doing a tenant build out is greatly decreased. Mr. McNaughton said he knows his plan is in conflict with Village ordinance and he cannot stop work without the permit expiring. He does not believe there is a danger to the public nor is it an eyesore or public nuisance to the Village.

Trustee Grela said he has a problem with no slab and does not see what the objective is other than just to have a foundation in the ground and will the rest of the building go up in 60, 90, 120 days. Will it be weed fest 2010 when you do not have a slab around or on top of the box?

Mr. McNaughton said they would control the weeds and it will be a cleaner look than it is right now.

Trustee Grela said once this site gets mobilized, even though you are putting the binder down and the landscaping, won't the landscaping get trampled on by building the wall.

Mr. McNaughton answered that he is not going to do the landscaping around the building. He is doing the perimeter landscaping of the entire site.

Mr. Stricker made the comment that he does not understand the relationship between all of the improvements that are required and the foundation.

Mr. McNaughton said that from the outside edge of the foundation to the back side of the curb is 8 feet all the way around the building. Putting the curb in and trying to dig a trench and put a foundation in and backfill it would be really hard to do and time consuming. If he had that in and all back filled, the time savings is enormous. He has too much money invested in Phase III to just let it go back to the bank. It's not an open foundation that anyone could fall into; you will not even see it 9307

føjt

from Meadowbrook Drive or 83<sup>rd</sup> Street. There is a procedure in the ordinance to renew permits. It calls for paying 10% of the permit amount every six months and he would be willing to do so but it states he may only do it once. That is what he is asking relief from.

Trustee Sodikoff wanted to clarify that Mr. McNaughton's concern that the permit process itself takes a significant amount of time and once you have the tenant ready to go, you want to be able to have the permit available. Are his needs met if the permit is granted now, if this stays open but you are not allowed to put in either the foundation until you are ready to go, what we are talking about is everything could be pre-approved but avoid the issue that Trustee Grela is concerned about, then we have a foundation and building never goes in. Mr. McNaughton would have an open permit and it would not have to be extended and everything could be pre-approved. The only real delay is the pouring of the foundation and if and when you think you have a tenant, you could pull the permit at that point and do it.

Mr. McNaughton said the delay is more than the 60 days of pouring the foundation. The delay is putting in the curb and getting the grade right and the binder and then all of the other things like bringing public improvements to the property. It would be kind of hard to put the curb in without having the foundation in first because it's only 8 feet away from the curb.

Mr. Pollock said he shares Trustee Grela's concerns but feels there are some unique circumstances here that may help mitigate those issues. These two foundations are pretty much internal to the project; the only way you can see these building sites is off Meadowbrook Drive. The public interest is best served by getting the berm and landscaping done along Meadowbrook as quickly as possible. Once that is done, there is no public impact of having these sites unfinished except for the people who work there perhaps but that's limited and they are tenants of the owner.

Trustee Grela spoke about issues that become precedential. He is fearful that if the Board approves this, will the Village then have a number of residential or non-residential developers coming before the Board asking for the same.

Terry Barnicle, Village Attorney, addressed Trustee Grela's concern. First of all, the precedential issue is more typically a zoning issue rather than a building code issue. However, he would share that concern about having precedent being set that would enable other builders or developers to come in and ask for similar relief. Maybe allow some consideration because of the economy for a time period.

Trustee Paveza stated that staff gave three conditions and asked if that would narrow the precedence in anyway.

Mr. Barnicle answered yes to the extent that the pre-conditions are existent here and are not existent in the "next applicant". He said he would make a point of saying that this request is being considered due to the nature of the current economy.

from

The three conditions staff has proposed are:

- 1. Each building foundation and its related parking lot and landscaping improvements shall proceed in a timely manner as per the applicable regulations for the duration of a building permit.
- 2. The two month expiration of the building permits for each of the two buildings as per Section 222.3 shall be extended for a period for one year as it applies to the vertical construction of the buildings only.
- 3. All grading and landscaping (except for the construction drive from Meadowbrook Drive) shall be completed prior to November 15, 2009, or if the foundations are not constructed until 2010, the grading and landscaping shall be completed within two months after a building permit is issued for each of the two buildings.

<u>Motion</u> was made by Trustee DeClouette and seconded by Trustee Allen to accept the staff recommendation subject to the recommended conditions and with the finding that this approval is based on the unique nature of the economy at this time.

On Roll Call, Vote Was:

AYES: 4 – Trustees DeClouette, Allen, Sodikoff & Paveza

NAYS: 1 – Trustee Grela ABSENT: 1 – Trustee Wott

There being four affirmative votes, the motion carried.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

**AUDIENCE** There were none at this time.

#### REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM VILLAGE OFFICIALS

Trustee Grela said that some of the silt fences in the Savoy Club need to be fixed and reinstalled. He continued that he recalls that Mr. Callaghan was waiting for his electrical permit in order for him to connect the aerators. That was last fall. There are no aerators installed. What is the status?

Mr. Pollock answered it is the first he has heard of it and will look into it.

Mr. Barnicle updated the Board regarding the proceeding before the ICC concerning Com Ed's request for reimbursement associated with the tree trimming performed earlier this year along the transmission lines.

Mr. Barnicle talked about the financing for the police facility. At the next Board meeting, there will be a public hearing on the intent to issue debt certificates. From the standpoint of the Village, they are really no different than alternate revenue bonds. From the standpoint of the rating service and 9309

Skjt

the bond community, there is minimal if any impact whatsoever because of the change. Currently going through a 30 day petition period which means that the debt certificates will not actually be issued on the 24<sup>th</sup> so a meeting will be held on the 31<sup>st</sup>; the date bids are received on the debt certificates. It will be a short meeting to award the financing. The 30 day period is important because of the fact that if, when you get to the end of maturity for the debt certificates, the property is still not sold, Village will probably have to go to refunding bonds to pay off the debt certificates and extend out the debt until it is able to come up with the money from other sources. The Village wants to have that capacity now and not let it go into the future.

As far as the coverage ratio, there is plenty of income from the sales tax and the potential sale of land to cover the interest payments to the balloon payment but the problem is the payment and the Village cannot show enough sales tax coming in that year to be 1.25 times the final amount of the financing. That is the reason why it has gone from alternate revenue bonds to the debt certificates.

The 30 day petition period, expires around the 27<sup>th</sup>. If no petition is filed within that 30 days period it's automatic. If the Board so chooses, when the balloon payment comes up, to issue refunding bonds to pay off the debt certificates, it is their choice at that time.

There was lengthy discussion about interest rates, bonds vs. debt certificates, the 3 yr. vs. 5 yr. decision, refinancing.

Chief John Madden talked about incidents of vandalism in the Village.

**ADJOURNMENT** Motion was made by Trustee DeClouette and seconded by Trustee Allen that the Regular Meeting of August 10, 2009 be adjourned.

On Voice Vote, the motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE: Where there is no summary of discussion on any items in the minutes, this reflects that no discussion occurred other than the introduction of the item.

Karen J. Thomas

Village Clerk

Burr Ridge, Illinois

APPROVED BY the President and Board of Trustees this 29th day of August 2009.

fijt

# AGENDA REGULAR MEETING – MAYOR & BOARD OF TRUSTEES VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE

August 10, 2009 7:00 p.m.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Christyna Spreck
  Pleasantdale Elementary School
- 2. ROLL CALL
- 3. AUDIENCE
- 4. CONSENT AGENDA OMNIBUS VOTE

All items listed with an asterisk (\*) are considered routine by the Village Board and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Board member or citizen so request, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda.

#### 5. MINUTES

- \*A. Approval of Regular Meeting of July 13, 2009
- \*B. Approval of Regular Meeting of July 27, 2009
- \*C. Receive and File Veterans Memorial Committee Meeting of July 8, 2009
- \*D. Receive and File Draft Veterans Memorial Committee Meeting of July 15, 2009
- \*E. Receive and File Draft Veterans Memorial Committee Meeting of July 22, 2009
- \*F. Receive and File Draft Plan Commission Committee Meeting of August 3, 2009
- \*G. Receive and File Draft Downtown Events Planning Committee Meeting of August 4, 2009

#### 6. ORDINANCES

\*A. Approval of An Ordinance Granting Special Uses for a Restaurant with Sales of Alcoholic Beverages, Extended Hours of Operation and for a Non-Residential Fence Pursuant to the Village of Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance (Z-06-2009: 15W776 North Frontage Rd – Porterhouse Steak & Seafood)



- \*B. Approval of An Ordinance Granting Variations from the Village of Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance for Parking Lot Landscaping (Z-06-2009: 15W776 North Frontage Rd Porterhouse Steak & Seafood)
- \*C. Approval of An Ordinance Granting a Special Use for a Training Center for Developmentally Disabled Persons Pursuant to the Village of Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance (Z-07-2009: 16W361 South Frontage Road By Your Side)
- \*D. Approval of An Ordinance Granting a Special for a School for Developmentally Disabled Persons Pursuant to the Village of Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance (Z-08-2009: 8320 Madison Street Soaring Eagle Academy)

#### 7. RESOLUTIONS

#### 8. CONSIDERATIONS

- A. <u>Consideration of Plan Commission Recommendation to Approve Lot Line Variation (V-03-2009: 21 Woodgate Drive Johnston)</u>
- B. <u>Consideration of Plan Commission Recommendation to Approve Rezoning and Variations (Z-09-2009: 7700 County Line Road Village of Burr Ridge)</u>
- C. <u>Consideration of Request from W.H. McNaughton Builders for Relief from Section 222 of the Building Ordinance Related to the Duration and Expiration of Building Permits</u>
- \*D. Approval of Plan Commission Recommendation to Add "Event Planning and Limousine Charter Service" to the List of Special Uses in the B-2 District (PC-07-2009; 15W320 North Frontage Road Elvis Limousine and Charter)
- \*E. Approval of Recommendation to Award Contract for Material Testing Services in Conjunction with the New Police Facility
- \*F. Approval of Vendor List
- G. Other Considerations For Announcement, Deliberation and/or Discussion Only No Official Action will be Taken

#### 9. AUDIENCE

#### 10. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM VILLAGE OFFICIALS

#### 11. ADJOURNMENT